

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03362 132130Z

66

ACTION CCO-00

INFO OCT-01 PASS-00 (ISO) W

----- 062925

Z 132050Z JUN 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC FLASH 6320

INFO AMEMBASSY CAIRO FLASH

S E C R E T USNATO 3362

EXDIS-DISTRIBUTE AS NODIS

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PFOR, NATO

SUBJECT: NATO DECLARATION JUNE 13 DISCUSSION OF PARAGRAPHS 9 AND 11

TOSEC

REF: A) USNATO 3327 B) STATE 125558

BEGIN SUMMARY: IN NAC, JUNE 13, AGREEMENT WAS REGISTERED ON SLIGHT CHANGE IN PARAGRAPH NINE TO ACCOMMODATE IRISH PROBLEM. PARAGRAPH ELEVEN LEFT BRACKETED BY U.S. AND FRANCE. BRIEF NAC MEETING NOW SCHEDULED FOR NOON, JUNE 14, MAY PROVIDE LAST OPPORTUNITY TO RESOLVE THIS ISSUE BEFORE OTTAWA. END SUMMARY.

1. LUNS OPENED DISCUSSION OF ATLANTIC DECLARATION IN SPECIAL NAC, JUNE 13, WITH HOPE THAT AGREEMENT COULD BE REACHED ON PARAGRAPH 11 IN ORDER TO AVOID TAKING BRACKETED TEXT TO OTTAWA. LUNS ALSO EXPRESSED HOPE THAT COMPROMISE FORMULA RECOMMENDED BY COUNCIL DEAN DE STAERCKE ON JUNE 12 (AND CONTAINED PARA 3 USNATO 3327), MIGHT FORM BASIS OF AGREEMENT. LUNS REPEATED NEED FOR TAKING AGREED DOCUMENT TO OTTAWA SINCE PUBLIC OR PRESS AWARENESS OF DIFFERENCES COULD DAMAGE THE IMPACT OF THE DECLARATION. MOREOVER, DISCUSSION OF ANY POINT LEFT UNAGREED MIGHT PROMPT DISCUSSION BY OTHER MINISTERS ALSO OF PROVISIONS WHICH HAD ALREADY BEEN APPROVED. LUNS THEN TURNED FLOOR OVER TO UK CHARGE LOGAN FOR EXPLANATION OF PROBLEM WHICH HAD ARISEN ON PARAGRAPH 9.

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03362 132130Z

2. LOGAN SAID THAT DURING CONSULTATIONS WITH UK, IRAISH HAD OBJECTED TO AGREED "EUROPEAN COMMUNITY" LANGUAGE IN PARAGRAPH 9 (PARA 1 REF A) SINCE IT MIGHT GIVE IMPRESSION THAT IRELAND COULD ALSO BE CONSIDERED AS MAKING

A CONTRIBUTION TO COMMON ALLIANCE DEFENSE. LOGAN THUS PROPOSED, AND OTHERS ACCEPTED, FOLLOWING TEXT WHICH WOULD MEET IRISH CONCERNS:

"IT IS ALSO RECOGNIZED THAT THE FURTHER PROGRESS TOWARDS UNITY WHICH THE MEMBER STATES OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY ARE DETERMINED TO MAKE SHOULD HAVE IN DUE COURSE A BENEFICIAL EFFECT ON THE CONTRIBUTION TO THE COMMON DEFENSE OF THE ALLIANCE OF THOSE OF THEM WHO BELONG TO IT." UK-PROPOSED AMENDMENT WAS ACCEPTED.

3. LUNS OPENED DISCUSSION OF PARAGRAPH 11 WITH RENEWED REFERENCE TO BELGIAN COMPROMISE TEXT AS BASIS FOR AGREEMENT ON SECOND SENTENCE. DE ROSE (FRANCE) SAID THAT HIS AUTHORITIES HAD EXAMINED THIS MATTER VERY CAREFULLY BUT FRANCE WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO MODIFY ITS POSITION BEYOND THE TEXT WHICH IT HAD PROPOSED ON JUNE 12 (SEE PARA 2, USNATO 3307).

4. DE ROSE REMINDED THE COUNCIL OF THE SERIOUSNESS WITH WHICH THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT VIEWS THE DECLARATION. HE STRESSED THAT FRANCE, AS ASSERTED IN THE FIRST SENTENCE OF PARAGRAPH 11, WAS FULLY PREPARED TO PARTICIPATE IN ALLIANCE CONSULTATIONS. FRANCE CONSIDERED CONSULTATIONS AS AN ENTIRELY NORMAL AND REGULAR ELEMENT IN THE LIFE OF THE ALLIANCE BUT COULD NOT ACCEPT ANYTHING OF A "CONTRACTURAL" NATURE. MOREOVER, FRANCE WISHED TO AVOID ANY FIXED OBLIGATION OR FORMAT FOR CONSULTING ON MATTERS OUTSIDE THE ALLIANCE'S AREA OF INTEREST. DE ROSE CLOSED BY SAYING THAT FRANCE HAD SINCERELY TRIED TO MEET ALLIED CONCERNS, AND PARTICULARLY THOSE OF THE U.S., ON CONSULTATION LANGUAGE. FRENCH GOVERNMENT FELT THAT IT HAD ALREADY GONE QUITE A DISTANCE TO MEET ALLIED INTERESTS.

5. RUMSFELD EXPRESSED DISAPPOINTMENT THAT COUNCIL COULD NOT REACH AGREEMENT. THINKING BACK OVER THE HISTORY OF THE DECLARATION, EVERY DELEGATION HAD MADE COMPROMISES AS IS IN THE VERY NATURE OF THE ALLIANCE. HE REMINDED THAT THE UK VERSION WAS NOT OUR PREFERRED TEXT BUT WE HAD AGREED TO IT AND TO SUBSEQUENT CHANGES TO IT, IN SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03362 132130Z

AN EFFORT TO REACH AGREEMENT. IN READING U.S.-PREFERRED VERSION (PARA 1, STATE 125558), AS AMENDED, RUMSFELD SAID HE FAILED TO SEE HOW IT COULD BE CONSIDERED A TIGHT CONTRACTURAL DOCUMENT OR ONE UNDER WHICH FRANCE COULD BE EXPECTED TO CONTRIBUTE MORE THAN IT WAS WILLING TO DO AS DE ROSE HAD STATED. HE NOTED THAT ADJECTIVES RELATING TO THEIR "COMMON INTERESTS" AND "APPROPRIATE MEANS" EFFECTIVELY QUALIFIED

OBLIGATIONS TAKEN UNDER THE SENTENCE. MOREOVER TEXT NOW SAYS THAT EVENTS IN OTHER AREAS OF THE WORLD "CAN" HAVE AN EFFECT ON ALLIANCE INTERESTS NOT THAT THEY "WILL" IN EVERY INSTANCE. IN SUMMARY, RUMSFELD THOUGHT FRANCE'S CONCERNS HAD BEEN MET.

6. LUNS ASKED RUMSFELD IF THE U.S. WERE PREPARED TO ACCEPT THE

BELGIAN COMPROMISE SENTENCE 2. RUMSFELD RESPONDED THAT WE WERE PREPARED TO ACCEPT U.S.-PREFERRED VERSION HE HAD CITED ABOVE. DE ROSE NOTED THAT FRANCE WAS IN EXACTLY THE SAME POSITION AS THE U.S. WITH REGARD TO COMPROMISE LANGUAGE.

7. LUNS CLOSED DISCUSSION SAYING THERE WAS LITTLE UTILITY IN GOING ON WITH DISCUSSIONS IN BRUSSELS AND THAT COUNCIL MUST ACCEPT TAKING A BRACKETED TEXT TO OTTAWA. LUNS SAID IT WAS HIS UNDERSTANDING THAT OTHER DELEGATIONS WERE PREPARED TO ACCEPT THE BELGIAN COMPROMISE BUT HE COULD NOT SEE HOW THE DEADLOCK COULD NOW BE BROKEN IN BRUSSELS. IT WAS THEREFORE AGREED THAT THE TEXT FOR OTTAWA WOULD CONTAIN THREE BRACKETED VERSIONS OF SENTENCE 2, PARAGRAPH 11, AS FOLLOWS: 1) FRENCH, 2) U.S. AND 3) BELGIAN COMPROMISE VERSION.

8. COMMENT: IN PRIVATE CONVERSATION, CANADIAN PERMREP MENZIES SAID HE THOUGHT OUR BARGAINING POSITION WITH THE FRENCH WAS SUBSTANTIALLY REDUCED BY INFORMING THEM IN ADVANCE OF THE PRESIDENT'S INTEREST IN SIGNING THE DECLARATION IN BRUSSELS AFTER THE OTTAWA MINISTERIAL.

9. BRIEF NAC WILL BE CALLED FOR FRIDAY NOON TO DISCUSS ANOTHER MATTER. THIS OFFERS AN OPPORTUNITY FOR US TO AGREE TO THE BELGIAN COMPROMISE, WHICH IN MY VIEW IS BETTER LANGUAGE FOR THE U.S. THAN THE U.S. BRACKETED TEXT AND ALSO BETTER THAN THE UK VERSION WHICH THE U.S. SUPPORTED. THIS WOULD ISOLATE FRANCE AND, EITHER ENCOURAGE THEM TO AGREE ALSO OR AT WORST WOULD PUT FRENCH IN POSITION OF BEING TOTALLY ISOLATED RATHER THAN IN CONFLICT WITH SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 03362 132130Z

U.S. END COMMENT.

10. REQUEST GUIDANCE FOR USE DURING MORNING, JUNE 13, PRIOR TO NOON MEETING.
RUMSFELD

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 13 JUN 1974
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO03362
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740687/abbryvpt.tel
Line Count: 147
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: NODIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: NODIS
Reference: A) USNATO 3327 B) STATE 125558
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 03 APR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <03 APR 2002 by izenbei0>; APPROVED <17 JUN 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: LOCK1
Status: NATIVE
Subject: NATO DECLARATION JUNE 13 DISCUSSION OF PARAGRAPHS 9 AND 11
TAGS: PFOR, NATO
To: STATE FLASH INFO CAIRO FLASH
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005